

## REMARKS

Claims 1-34 are pending. An Office Action mailed January 20, 2006 rejected Claims 1-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103. By way of this Amendment, Applicant hereby submits drawing changes, amends the specification and Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9-12, 15, and 30, and cancels Claims 3, 6-8, 16-29, and 31-34. Pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.111, Applicant hereby respectfully requests reconsideration of the application.

### REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected Claims 1, 16, 30, and 34 as being unpatentable over Games et al. (Games) in view of Birkedahl et al (hereinafter Birkedahl). With regard to amended independent Claims 1 and 30, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant submits that Games shows three backplane buses that are shared by all units and Birkedahl shows two backplane buses 11A, 11B that are shared by all of the units, and third and fourth backplane buses 11C and 11D that are only shared by different subsets of the units. Games only teaches 3 communication lines between the communication units (Fig. 2). Birkedahl does not teach or suggest that all the processing nodes receive on all four of the backplane buses 11A, 11B, 11C and 11D.

Therefore, Applicant submits that Games and Birkedahl, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a network topology backplane bus architecture having four independent data communication lines, with one or more processing notes associated with a first enclosure for transmitting on only a first and second of the four data communication lines and one or more other processing notes associated with a second enclosure for transmitting on only a third and fourth of the data communication lines and all of the processing notes being capable of receiving data on all of the data communication lines. Therefore, Applicant submits that amended independent Claims 1 and 30 are allowable over the cited references.

The Office Action rejected Claims 2-15 as being unpatentable over Games and Birkedahl in view of Baker et al. (hereinafter Baker). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant submits that Baker fails to overcome the deficiencies of Games and Birkedahl. Therefore, because Claims 2, 4, 5, and 9-15 depend from allowable independent Claim 1, they are allowable for the same reasons that make their corresponding independent claim allowable.

#### CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims of the pending application are now in condition for allowance over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections, allowance, and early passage through issuance. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's agent listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM<sup>PLLC</sup>

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mike Smith", is written over the printed name.

Michael S. Smith

Registration No. 39,563

Direct Dial: 206.749.9888